Please add new claims 63 and 64 as follows.

- --63. (New) A display device according to claim 1 wherein said one of said substrates comprises a plastic.
- 64. (New) A display device according to claim 36 wherein said substrate comprises a plastic.--

## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 35, 36, 37, 46, and 56 are amended. Claims 63 and 64 are newly added. No new matter is added.

Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. This rejection appears improper because claim 49 has already been canceled in a previous amendment mailed on June 6, 2000.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10, 13-19, 28-32, 39, 42-49 and 51-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over USP 5,200,847 to Mawatari et al. This, however, is incorrect in view of the claim limitations and the respective amendment.

ney's Docket No.: 07977-01900 US 2961/2965/2966D1

Claims 1, 2, 4, 28, 36, 39, 42, and 43 as amended are patentable over Mawatari in part because Mawatari fails to disclose or suggest that thin film transistors of a driver circuit "are formed from a stick substrate separate from said substrates and are peeled from said stick substrate after the formation." This feature is supported in Figs. 5A to 5D of the specification. In fact, Mawatari teaches away this feature of Claims 1, 2, 4, 28, 39, 42, and 43 as amended by disclosing that driver elements 118 and 119 are not separated from the glass substrate 101 (column 8, lines 43-46). Therefore, amended -Claims 1, 2, 4, 28, 39, 42, and 43 should be distinctly patentable over Mawatari.

Claims 7-10, 13-19, 29, 30-32, and 44-47, 49, and 51-54 are patentable in part because nothing in Mawatari discloses that, "a passivation film covering said driver circuit and having a contact hole to allow an electrical connection between at least one of said thin film transistors and said pixel circuit, wherein said contact hole has a tapered configuration" (see, e.g., Claim 7 as amended). It is respectfully requested that the Patent Office specifically indicate the contended teaching by Mawatari.

Claims 22, 23, 27, 55-57, 33-35 and 61-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mawatari in view of USP 4,643,526 to Watanabe et al. The Office Action

contends that Watanabe discloses connection of a driver circuit (an IC chip 32) to internal circuit (conductive films 22a and 22b) of a LCD device through a gold bump 33. However, Watanabe fails to disclose the claimed combination which includes that the driver circuit comprises thin film transistors and the driver circuit is connected to the substrate through a metal bump.

In addition, Mawatari and Watanabe could not be properly combined because Mawatari teaches against Watanabe for the contended combination. More specifically, Mawatari discloses that the display driving circuit comprising the thin-film transistor is less expensive than the IC chip in column 4, lines 37-51. Hence, the rejection is not proper and should be withdrawn.

Newly-added Claims 63 and 64 should be patentable over the cited prior art based on at least their dependence on Claims 1 and 36, respectively, which are patentable according to the above argument.

All pending claims further stand rejected over USP 5,834,327 based on non-statutory double patenting. Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office to hold such rejection in abeyance until other rejections are resolved.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the rejections to all pending claims should be overcome except for the double

patenting rejection. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If there are any other charges, or any credits, please apply them to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

Scott C. Harris

Reg. No. 32,030

PTO Customer No. 20985

Fish & Richardson P.C.

4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500

San Diego, CA 92122

Telephone:

(858) 678-5070

Facsimile: (858

(858) 678-5099

\_10067289.doc